

REMARKS

Claims 1-12 are pending. Claims 2 and 3 have been amended to correct minor claim wording. No new matter has been added by way of the amendment. Reconsideration of the application, as amended, is respectfully requested.

Claims 2 and 3 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. The Examiner has stated that the limitation "the other network node" in claims 2 and 3 lacks antecedent basis. In response to this objection, Applicant has appropriately amended the claims. Accordingly, entry of these claim amendments, and reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection are respectfully requested.

In the Office Action of January 27, 2005, independent claims 1, 5 and 9, and dependent claims 2, 3, 6, 7 and 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,708,217 ("*Colson*"), while dependent claims 4 and 8 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being obvious over *Colson* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,940,740 ("*Aas*"). For the following reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections are respectfully requested.

The claimed invention relates to an apparatus and methods for redirecting network content to another network node in a network comprising mobile terminals, content servers and gateway servers. The apparatus recited in independent claim 1 similarly includes "a data store for storing a user-supplied designation of the other network node; a sensible indicator for indicating whether the user has requested redirection of data content; and a data path operatively connected to the data store and to the sensible indicator and adaptable to route data content to the mobile terminal or the other network node designated in the data store according to the sensible indicator".

Typically, a need for redirection of network content to another network node might occur in cases where a device that requests content cannot render the content format, such as when the device cannot display a particular document, but there is another network node that is capable of displaying the document. Another reason for redirecting content occurs, for example, if, based on prior experience with the content, the user determines that the document would display better with another rendering device, even though the original device was capable of rendering the content.

*Colson* relates to a system and method for receiving and demultiplexing multi-modal document content (see Abstract and col. 1, lines 8-10). *Colson* discloses a technique whereby multi-modal document content can be received, demultiplexed and distributed to one or more

appropriate content renderers (see col. 3, lines 50-65). With respect to the element of claim 1 directed to a "data store", *Colson* fails to teach "a data store for storing a user-supplied designation of the another network". *Colson* describes a technique that includes content requesting clients, a demultiplexing component; content renderers and file servers interconnected in a network; content requests from the clients to the file servers; and demultiplexing response content to relevant content renderers based on the content type indicated (see col. 4, lines 7-20).

With respect to the element of claim 1 directed to "a sensible indicator", the Office Action (pg. 4, ¶ 8) states that *Colson* teaches a sensible indicator for indicating whether the user has requested redirection of data content, referring to col. 7, lines 57-62 and col. 8, lines 2-14, which describes redirecting decisions based on content types and the respective content registry entries. Independent claim 1 includes the limitation "a data store for storing a user-supplied designation of the another network". Claim 1 also includes "a sensible indicator for indicating whether a user has requested redirection of data content". In accordance with claim 1, the user requests the redirection. *Colson* fails to teach these claimed features, i.e. there is no user supplied designation for selecting which node to direct data content for printing. Rather, the selection that occurs is based on an automatic designation of a device that is appropriate for rendering a specific type of content, e.g., a facsimile for text/ascii code, a handheld device for text/html.

With respect to the element of claim 1 directed to "a data path", the Office Action (pg. 4, ¶ 8) states, "Colson teaches a data path operatively connected to the data store and to the sensible indicator and adaptable to route data content to the mobile terminal OR to the another network node designated in the data store according to the sensible indicator", citing *Colson* (col. 7, line 33 thru col. 8, line 14), which describes the process from content request through content demultiplexing to the content rendering with the relevant network connected content processors. However, the data path recited in claim 1 is different from the data path disclosed in *Colson*. In claim 1, redirecting decisions are made based on a user supplied designation to redirect content to another network device. *Colson* teaches an approach for unidirectional content delivery from request to rendering as seamlessly as possible by means of preregistered content type - content renderer - pairs. However, *Colson* fails to teach that the data path is adaptable to route data content to the mobile terminal or to the another network node designated in the data store according to the sensible indicator, as recited in independent claim 1.

The invention recited in claim 1 provides a data storage in which to store information about how to redirect content to another network node. As taught in *Colson* (Fig. 4A (see 430)), all content without a registry-defined renderer is discarded. On the other hand, in the present invention, this kind of data discarding is undesirable, since it is a goal to provide the user with the possibility to redirect data to another network node. Thus, the invention recited in claim 1 has advantages over *Colson*, because data without a predetermined renderer is not discarded at the time that it is received. Rather, the data is redirected to another network node based on a user-supplied designation. In view of the foregoing, independent claim 1 is not anticipated by *Colson* and thus, withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §102 is in order, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

*Aas* relates to a method and apparatus for verifying that a message has been transmitted to or received by an intended recipient (see col. 1, lines 5-7). *Aas* states, a message sender is requested to create a message ID which is used to identify a message being sent by the message sender. At some later time, the message sender can query the message center using the sender generated message ID to ask the center to verify whether the message has either been sent to or received by the intended recipient (see Abstract). *Aas* fails to cure the deficiencies of *Colson*, because *Aas* fails to teach or suggest limitation "a data store for storing a user-supplied designation of the another network," as recited in independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent claim 1 is patentable over the combination of *Colson* and *Aas*, and therefore withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §103 is in order, and a notice to that effect is earnestly solicited.

Independent claims 5 and 9 are method claims associated with the apparatus of independent claim 1. Accordingly, independent method claims 5 and 9 are patentable over the combination of the cited references for the reasons discussed above with respect to independent apparatus claim 1.